

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-27 are currently pending. Applicant acknowledges receipt of the above-referenced Office Action and respectfully traverses the Office Action in its entirety. However, in an effort to expedite allowance of the currently pending claims, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to more clearly describe the distinguishing characteristics thereof.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 7-13, 16-22, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,839 to Advani et al (“Advani”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142143 to Brown et al (“Brown”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,131,113 to Chang et al (“Chang”). Applicant respectfully traverses. The currently pending claims are directed to a display in a display device which enables a user to see a variety of information in a single display, the information related to processor usage for each of at least two processors in a multiprocessor system. The information in the display comprises processor assignment, processor availability, and clustering, as well as a second graphic type indicative of an application assignment for each application groups associated with each of the processors. This sort of at-a-glance information is very helpful when administering complex, multi-processor servers and other computing systems. Prior to Applicant’s invention of the claimed display, administrators did not have ready access to such information. Instead, administrators had to rely on combinations of displays such as those disclosed in Advani, Brown, and Chang. As the Examiner indicates, each of these references is directed to displaying certain information to users. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that the references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a visually informative display such as that claimed in the pending claims. In fact, Applicant respectfully asserts that the references inherently show the difficulty the computing industry has had in creating informative displays, especially with respect to the performance of complex multi-processor systems. The references disclose the need for increasingly complex displays of lines and charts, which is in contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention which is able to display the relevant information using a collection of a few graphic types. Thus, not only do Advani, Brown, and Chang fail to teach all elements of Applicant’s claimed invention, the references can be seen as teaching away from Applicant’s

claimed invention. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27 depend from claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has consistently held that where a claim is dependent upon a patentable independent claim, the dependent claim is *a fortiori* patentable because it contains all the limitations of the independent claim plus further limitations. See, e.g., Hartness Intern. Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co., 819 F.2d 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicant asserts that Claims these dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the claims from which they depend, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these dependent claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, it is submitted that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. Additional characteristics or arguments may exist that distinguish the claims over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully preserve their right to present these in the future, should they be necessary. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is courteously requested to contact applicant's undersigned representative.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing, and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-3790. If an extension of time is required, this should be considered a petition therefor. If the fees associated with a Request for Continued Examination are filed herewith, this should be considered a petition therefor.

Respectfully submitted,

/ James E. Goepel /

---

James E. Goepel (Reg. No. 50,851)  
Attorney for Applicant

**Unisys Corp.**  
Township Line and Union Meeting Roads  
Unisys Way E8-114  
Blue Bell, PA 19424  
(215) 986-6188

Filed: September 29, 2008